No.

Supreme Court of the United States

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

THOMAS F. RYAN, JR., Esq.
821 - 15th Street, N.W.
Washington 5, D. C.

Attorney for Texas Gas Exploration Corporation

WILLIAM G. LOVE, Esq.
Houston Club Building
Houston, Texas

DONALD J. MULVIHILL, Esq.
1000 Vermont Avenue, N.W.
Washington 5, D. C.

EUGENE F. SIKOROVSKY, Esq.
80 Pine Street
New York 5, N. Y.

Attorneys for J. Ray McDermott & Co., Inc.

ROBERT E. MAY, Esq.
1700 K Street, N.W.
Washington 6, D. C.

Attorney for Callery Properties, Inc.

JOHN A. O'CONNOR, Esq.
H. Y. ROWE, Esq.
303 Murphy Building
El Dorado, Arkansas

Attorneys for Ocean Drilling & Exploration Co.

WILLIAM J. MERRILL, Esq.
WILLIAM H. HOLLOWAY, Esq.
GEORGE H. LAWRENCE, Esq.
P. O. Box 2180
Houston 1, Texas

Attorneys for Humble Oil & Refining Co.

ROBERT J. STANTON, Esq.
JOSEPH W. MORRIS, Esq.
KENNETH SCOTT, Esq.
P. O. Box 2040
Tulsa, Oklahoma

ROBERT E. MAY, Esq.
1700 K Street, N.W.
Washington 6, D. C.

Attorneys for Amerada Petroleum Corp.

JACK T. CONN, Esq.
1400 Republic Building
Oklahoma City 2, Oklahoma

WM. AMORY UNDERHILL, Esq.
1625 K Street, N.W.
Washington 6, D. C.

Attorneys for Kerr-McGee Oil Industries, Inc.

ROBERT W. HENDERSON, Esq.
THOMAS G. CROUCH, Esq.
700 Mercantile Bank Bldg.
Dallas 1, Texas

ROBERT E. MAY, Esq.
1700 K Street, N.W.
Washington 6, D. C.

Attorneys for Caroline Hunt Sands and Loyd B. Sands

ROSS MADOLE, Esq.
WILLIAM S. RICHARDSON, Esq.
ROY L. MERRILL, Esq.
P. O. Box 900
Dallas 21, Texas

WILLIAM P. MCCLURE, Esq.
1710 H Street, N.W.
Washington 6, D. C.

Attorneys for Socony Mobil Oil Company, Inc.

CECIL N. COOK, Esq.
NEAL POWERS, JR., Esq.
P. O. Box 1181
Houston, Texas

Attorneys for Beck Oil Company, et al.

RAYBURN L. FOSTER, Esq.
WM. J. ZEMAN, Esq.
H. K. HUDSON, Esq.
KENNETH HEADY, Esq.
JAMES G. WILLIAMS, JR., Esq.
Phillips Petroleum Company
Bartlesville, Oklahoma

CHARLES E. MCGEE, Esq.
1145 - 19th Street, N.W.
Washington 6, D. C.

Attorneys for Phillips Petroleum Company

GEORGE D. HORNING, JR., Esq.
800 Colorado Building
Washington 5, D. C.

Attorney for Union Oil Company of California

ROBERT O. KOCH, Esq.
CLYDE E. WILLBERN, Esq.
P. O. Box 1404
Houston 1, Texas

Attorneys for Tidewater Oil Company

LLOYD F. THANHOUSER, Esq.
BRUCE R. MERRILL, Esq.
ROBERT C. HAWLEY, Esq.
P. O. Box 2197
Houston, Texas

Attorneys for Continental Oil Company

L. A. THOMPSON, Esq.
W. W. HEARD, Esq.
J. P. HAMMOND, Esq.
C. O. STONE, JR., Esq.
P. O. Box 591
Tulsa 2, Oklahoma

WILLIAM J. GROVE, Esq.
600 Munsey Building
Washington 4, D. C.

Attorneys for Pan American Petroleum Corporation

LUCIUS M. LAMAR, Esq.
WOOLLEN H. WALSH, Esq.
800 The California Co. Building
New Orleans 12, Louisiana

JUSTIN R. WOLF, Esq.
1625 K Street, N.W.
Washington 6, D. C.

Attorneys for The California Company

J. EVANS ATTWELL, Esq.
First City National Bank Building
Houston 2, Texas

Attorneys for Kerr-McGee Properties, Inc., et al., Bel Oil Corporation and Richardson & Bass (Louisiana Account)

CLEON L. BURT, Esq.
407 North 8th Street
St. Louis 1, Missouri

W. RUSSELL GORMAN, Esq.
1701 K Street, N.W.
Washington 6, D. C.

Attorneys for Mississippi River Fuel Corporation

INDEX.

	PAGE
OPINIONS BELOW	2
JURISDICTION	2
QUESTIONS PRESENTED	2
STATUTE INVOLVED	4
STATEMENT	4
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT	10
1. The meaning of *Catco* and the authority of the Commission under *Catco* present questions of general importance in the interpretation and administration of the Natural Gas Act. The consequences of the decision below are of such far-reaching impact upon such a vast number of pending and future administrative proceedings affecting the natural gas industry and the public that it is vital that the questions involved be decided finally by this Court	10
2. The Court of Appeals has misconstrued and misapplied the decision of this Court in *Catco* and has decided a federal question in a way in conflict with an applicable decision of this Court	14
3. The Commission's establishment of a standard in implementation of its duty under *Catco* by which to judge these and other producer prices in certificate proceedings was a reasonable exercise of administrative judgment and should not have been set aside by the Court of Appeals. The propriety of the	

PAGE

action of the court below presents a question of general importance not only in the administration of the Natural Gas Act but also in the general field of judicial review of administrative action 18

4. The Commission's order was supported by substantial evidence. The Court of Appeals erred in concluding otherwise and in disregarding the separate basis of the Commission's conclusion that the proposed prices were not "out of line" with 1953, 1954 and 1955 prices 22

CONCLUSION 25

CITATIONS.

CASES:

	PAGE
Atlantic Refining Company v. *Public Service Commission*, 360 U. S. 378, decided June 22, 1959	2
Colorado Interstate Gas Co. v. *F. P. C.*, 324 U. S. 581, 589-590 (1945)	21
Far East Conference v. *United States*, 342 U. S. 570, 574 (1952)	21
F. C. C. v. *Allentown Broadcasting Co.*, 349 U. S. 358 (1955)	21
Gray v. *Powell*, 314 U. S. 402 (1941)	21
National Labor Relations Board v. *Hearst Publications*, 322 U. S. 111 (1944)	21
National Labor Relations Board v. *Seven-Up Bottling Co.*, 344 U. S. 344 (1953)	21
Public Service Commission of the State of New York v. *Federal Power Commission*, 361 U. S. 195 (1959)	9, 14
Railroad Comm. of Texas v. *Rowan & Nichols*, 310 U. S. 573 (1940), Opinion amend., 311 U. S. 614 (1941)	21
R. C. A. v. *United States*, 341 U. S. 412 (1951)	21
SEC v. *Chenery Corp.*, 332 U. S. 194 (1947)	21
The United Gas Improvement Co. v. *F. P. C.* (two cases) Nos. 18112 and 18113, decided February 22, 1961	12
Unemployment Compensation Commission v. *Aragon*, 329 U. S. 143 (1946)	21
United Gas Improvement Co. v. *F. P. C.*, 9th Cir., No. 16692 (October 31, 1960)	13
United Gas Improvement Co. v. *F. P. C.*, 10th Cir., No. 6280 (January 23, 1961)	13
United States v. *Detroit & Cleveland Nav. Co.*, 326 U. S. 236	24

COMMISSION ORDERS:

	PAGE
El Paso Natural Gas Co., 23 F. P. C. 369, rehearing denied, 23 F. P. C. 610	18
Gulf Oil Co., 23 F. P. C. 664	18
Humble Oil and Refining Co., order issued August 9, 1960, in Nos. G-13679, *et al.* (not yet reported)	19
Natural Gas Pipeline Co., order issued August 12, 1960, in Nos. G-12399, *et al.* (not yet reported)	19
Opinion No. 325, issued August 7, 1959	6
Peoples Gulf Coast Natural Gas Pipeline Co., 24 F. P. C. 1, amended, 24 F. P. C. 106	18, 19
Phillips Petroleum Co., 22 F. P. C. 694, modification denied, 22 F. P. C. 1021	18
South Georgia Natural Gas Co., et al., 22 F. P. C. 211	6
Southern Natural Gas Co., 19 F. P. C. 558	5
Trunkline Gas Co., 21 F. P. C. 704	5, 6
22 F. P. C. 391	11
22 F. P. C. 542	11

STATUTES:

Natural Gas Act, 15 U. S. C. §§717-717w,	
Section 19(b)	2
Section 7(e)	2, 4, 15, 16, 17
Section 7(c)	4, 16, 17
Judicial Code—28 U. S. C. §1254(1)	2

MISCELLANEOUS:

Bureau of Mines Minerals Yearbook, 1959	16
Statement of General Policy No. 61-1, as amended, issued September 28, 1960 (18 C. F. R. §2.56)	5
F. P. C., *Thirty-Ninth Ann. Rep.*, 1959, p. 75	12

PAGE

F. P. C., *Fortieth Ann. Rep.*, 1960, p. 71 12

F. P. C., *Release For Publication*, No. 11,329, G-6088, issued January 31, 1961 12

APPENDICES:

A.—Pertinent provisions of the Natural Gas Act of June 21, 1938, etc. 27

B.—Opinion and Judgment of U. S. Court of Appeals, District of Columbia Circuit 28

C.—Opinion of U. S. Court of Appeals, Ninth Circuit 35

D.—Opinion of U. S. Court of Appeals, Tenth Circuit 49

E.—Three Opinions Including Judge Brown's Dissent, of U. S. Court of Appeals, Fifth Circuit 56

No. _____

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1960.

SHELL OIL COMPANY, TEXAS GAS EXPLORATION CORPORATION, J. RAY MCDERMOTT & CO., INC., CALLERY PROPERTIES, INC., OCEAN DRILLING & EXPLORATION COMPANY, HUMBLE OIL & REFINING COMPANY, AMERADA PETROLEUM CORPORATION, KERR-MCGEE OIL INDUSTRIES, INC., CAROLINE HUNT SANDS AND LOYD B. SANDS, SOCONY MOBIL OIL COMPANY, INC., BECK OIL COMPANY, *et al.*, PHILLIPS PETROLEUM COMPANY, UNION OIL COMPANY OF CALIFORNIA, TIDEWATER OIL COMPANY, CONTINENTAL OIL COMPANY, PAN AMERICAN PETROLEUM CORPORATION, THE CALIFORNIA COMPANY, KILROY PROPERTIES, INC., *et al.*, BEL OIL CORPORATION, RICHARDSON & BASS (Louisiana Account), and MISSISSIPPI RIVER FUEL CORPORATION,

Petitioners,

v.

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK,

Respondent.

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT.

Petitioners, intervenors in the court below, pray that a writ of certiorari issue to review the judgment of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit entered in case No. 15,461 on December 8, 1960.